VEL
NE

ORTHODOXY

ORTHODOXY · AUTUMN 1961 · VOLUME IX · NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

COMMENT 39

A SPACE AGE PRAYER Fintan Fox, SSB 44

THE RUSSIAN SECTS M L James Schrank 46

RETURN TO SANITY
Alexander Turner, SSB 59

OREMUS Thoughts for the Praying Church 63

THE TRAGEDY OF MOUNT ATHOS
Ivan Michaelson Czap 64

NOTES 66

Orthodoxy, devoted to the life and thought of the Church, is published by the Basilian Fathers, The Orthodox Mission to western people, at 52 Kingsbridge Road West Mount Vernon, New York

Eight issues, domestic $2.00, foreign $3.00

Single copies domestic, 35 cents

Copyright 1961 by
The Society of Clerks Secular
of Saint Basil

Cover: The Russian delegation at the World Council of Churches Assembly, New Delhi. (RNS Photo)

Comment...

The sad panorama which unfolds in Mr Schrank's study of the Russian sects has much from which we can derive both religious education and spiritual profit. It is saddening to think that in Holy Russia, where Orthodox sanctity probably reached its loftiest heights – at least such heights as the American Christian can understand – there were also satanic madness guised as religion, and pathetic delusion leading to self-destruction which reminds one of the pitiful souls in Cuba who recently vowed to destroy their own children rather than allow them to fall into Castro's military conscription, and implored our prayers for their admittedly condemned souls!

Those of us who tend to think of all protestantism as a natural consequence of the Italian Schism should mark well the variety and extremes of the Russian sects, and swallow our pride! There may or may not be some relationship between the passionate sanctity of the staretz and the spiritual abyss of the 'Old Israel' (p 53) It is a familiar adage that 'the higher you go the harder you fall'. And if it doesn't apply individually in the spiritual life (except in the matter of pride) it would seem to occur too often in the spiritual life of societies, i e, in the contrasts between extreme asceticism and unbridled or rationalized license, e g, in the early gnostics and conspicuously in one Christian Church which we shall leave unnamed.

Be that as it may, we do see in all orders of separatism the seed of religious disintegration which has a loss of spiritual frame as its objective, and a declining internal fibre as its subjective, result. More than Buddhists, Moslems or Hindus, Christians must be aware of the sobre fact that their religion does not provide for degrees of commitment or varieties of opinion. One can not have his foot half in the door, half out. And he can not edit or rewrite it to suit his own tastes, as Mgr Alexander's article herein points out.

* * *

Having explored every order of religious belief and practice, Christians would seem to hear once again the call to 'one faith, one Lord and one baptism' which is a sine qua non of true Christianity.

Unity of spirit and the bond of peace do, however, have their price. We may be thankful for the spirit of fraternity which pervades our new relations with the Council

of Churches and its new members. But as we have felt called upon to point out in the past, the Council of Churches does not speak for Orthodoxy, and has several times delivered itself of pronouncements which Orthodox must feel constrained to oppose emphatically. And among those policies which we can not accept in good faith is the proposal for joint missionary activity by the International Missionary Council. Our Lord Jesus Christ did not live and die that we should spread the seeds of spiritual chaos abroad. And those non-Christians who contemplate the chaotic spectacle of contemporary western Christian sectarianism can only think it ridiculous when they are invited by denominational missionaries to share the uncertainties which have overtaken them!

The time has past for Orthodox to be apologetic about their trust, and for those derelict stewards of grace to proclaim for the benefit of all mankind those blessings which some have appropriated to their private comfort and prestige. If we truly believe in that catholic and apostolic Church which we profess with our lips, we must in honesty with ourselves and in good faith with its founder, speak our piece plainly. Christ did not found a Church for Christians to remain apart from. And if we accept pan-sectarianism or a branch theory – even tacitly – merely to avoid giving pain to our brothers, we are being dishonest with ourselves, deceptive to them, and unfaithful to the solemn trust reposed in us. There is no reason why the truth can not be spoken in charity: the fulfillment of Christian hope and the recovery of lost glory is to be found where it was left, in the Mother of Churches. A policy of silence excludes from God's grace those who might accept it if given the opportunity to hear it. Is our comfort worth their loss?

THE MARCH OF CRIME

Having long beleaguered our readers with alarums on the dangers we face, and particularly of the degenerating fibre of American society, we can scarcely avoid the sin of a resounding 'I told you so!' Any who may still feel that only a jaundiced disposition could entertain the thesis that we are coming directly under control of an unmoral and hence of a potentially criminal state of mind owe it to themselves to read the appalling story of Douglas Johnson, which appeared in *Life* for May 12, 1961.

It seems that Mr Johnson, a resident of Los Angeles, happened to see a bag of money – $240,000, in fact – fall from the door of an armored bank truck, picked it up, and returned it to the owners. Those who still maintain the inherent nobility and beauty of the human soul would presumably expect this honest act to have made Mr Johnson a pride to his community and a hero in the eyes of his fellows. But, in addition to the commendatory letters which one would expect, came hundreds which excoriated this Christian gentlemen for his honesty, derided him as a 'sucker' and a 'fool' and offered advice as to how he should have unloaded the money without detection. Seldom has the criminal mind revealed itself so clearly, brazenly, shamelessly. Mr Johnson's family was abused, his children taunted and tortured by classmates for the 'stupidity' of their parents.

This is a story which every American should read, for few incidents have so thoroughly revealed the growing criminal mind of America, and presumably, of those in other countries who import from us, not the integrity, diligence and self-respect which made this country the world's greatest, but

the crass self-indulgence, greed and vulgarity which are bringing our era of greatness to an early close.

Here is the America we are making – by obliviousness to the small offence from which the great offence grows: by encouragement of the mob spirit and neglect of our youth: by tolerance of the glowing invitations to crime which appear in our movies, radio, TV and press. Consider the shocking words of a veteran and once respected commentator reporting a burglary perpetrated by a gang of juvenile criminals on Long Island: 'Some operators!... Not bad even for professionals!' (Lowell Thomas over the Columbia Broadcasting System Tuesday, June 6, 6:45 PM New York time).

These enthusiastic words were not, of course, intended as an invitation to crime. But such is their unmistakable effect. And as the sentiment of a broadcaster who is regarded as worthy of commercial sponsorship, a network coverage and a considerable audience, they guage our cast of mind.

We have something to learn of the innocence and virtue of youth from the premeditated riots of the last Labor Day weekend, when some 2000 young criminals deliberately staged a riot at Ocean City, Md, and advertised it in advance with signs exhorting the reader to 'Fill your flask and come to the Second Annual Ocean City Riot'. Another 1500 staged a similar scene at Lake George, New York. Similarly sordid spectacles took place in other cities. *Time* magazine, innocent beyond its years, describes them in its September 15th issue under the head 'For its Own Sake', suggesting that *Time* may be coming of age. The hope is soon dispelled, however, by the further reference to these deliberate acts of crime as 'mischief' and 'merrymaking' in which ingenuousness our leading news magazine is joined by the press throughout the country.

Unflattering though they be, there are insistent facts of life which must be honestly faced if we are ever to rise from our present degradation. One of them is that crime is *crime*, and cannot be expunged by euphemisms such as 'high-jinks', 'mischief', 'pranks'. *Time* would appear to share the sentiment of those positive thinkers who feel that we must not be unkind to the evil-doer and that we should risk the stability of society rather than give offence to him. Perhaps it would hurt the feelings of the underprivileged to discriminate in favor of those personal qualities which they lack.

Gentler counsels prevail, however, in the case of the deliberate and unprovoked murder of two sixteen-year old boys last year. The original first degree murder charge upon which the criminals were convicted was reversed by the New York Court of Appeals at the behest of a committee to save the murderers sponsored by such figures as Mrs Franklin D Roosevelt, the Mayor of San Juan, and the New York City Commissioner of Correction. One of the offenders may now be released in about four years, according to the *New York World-Telegram*, while the case of the other is being appealed to the Supreme Court.

Should the vengeful instincts of the public further punish the resentenced murderer by insisting that he complete his sentence of seven and a half to fifteen years, he will doubtless have the support of other inmates of the New York State prison who recently staged a sit-down strike demanding, among other things, insured time off for good behaviour. The state parole director waited upon the demonstrators, to reassure the public that: 'They want no violence (but) are making a peaceful protest and

they know I am looking into the problem'. Apparently, like the New York City Commissioner of Correction, the latter official does not feel that we must go overboard in these matters, and that the wishes of the criminal, rather than social stability is the paramount consideration.

And yet another voice speaks to us from the halls of justice to take us to task for 'The Imperative to Punish', an article appearing in the *Atlantic Monthly* for July 1960. The Honorable David L Bazelon, a District of Columbia Judge, begins by citing the M'Naghton formula for criminal guilt which underlies Anglo-American court judgment and excuses from criminal responsibility only the individual who at the time of the crime 'was laboring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind as not to know' what he was doing, or that it was wrong. The author then proceeds to effectively discard this cogent formula by appealing for more help 'from modern behavioral scientists before trial, during trial and after trial', and by inferring that punishment is not really the remedy, and only the weakness of an unenlightened public in dealing with the misguided!

Now an I Q of ten would seem adequate to grasp the first principle of behavior: that we do what is pleasant and avoid what is not. Yet this would appear insufficiently doctrinaire for those who love to wallow in verbal flatulence and theoretical diversions. A plausible case can be made against the effectiveness of our penal system. But it can not rest on the allegations of Judge Bazelon and others that punishment is no deterrant. And to imply, as do those who hold this amazing position, that a man will not be restrained from what he knows will bring him personal disaster, is nonsense almost beyond the capacity of the mind, and suggestive of motives really ulterior to the subject.

What seems clear enough is that a) we do not think of ourselves as liable to apprehension and punishment which, like an accident, may happen to the man down the street, but I'm wiser or luckier; b) that we do not know from any vivid experience or illustration what punishment entails; c) that a vacation at the taxpayer's expense is the worst that can happen; d) and that that really won't be too bad since it will be subject to reduction for not murdering a guard.

Thus our penal system is a misnomer, and it will scarcely disturb the mind of the criminal because he has little to fear from it. Public sympathy is largely on his side and only indifferent toward the victim: penalty is trifling, a parole probably awaits, and he is permitted to demonstrate against the law if it does not: his absence from home will be spent at the taxpayer's expense in a country-club atmosphere where his largess can obtain whatever is lacking by neglect of the State.

It is not surprising under these circumstances that one million fingerprints are now on file with law-enforcement agencies, and that some 90,000 known offenders are sought. That justice is an exception in America is indicated by the statement of one official that those who assault police will be prosecuted. That is to say, it is newsworthy when someone says felons will be prosecuted!

The ineffectuality of our penal system is no more than we would expect under these circumstances. Its failure is not mysterious. What *is* mysterious, however, is that we should be urged to do away with such an inhuman policy of punishment and replace it with licence and conversation. Heaven forefend that our laws should work. This enlightened policy is in keeping with the consistent untruth which the law ex-

hibits on all sides – e g, in the city where *Orthodoxy* is published, signs warn motorists that a speed limit of twenty-five miles is 'strictly enforced', but motorists careen through streets at fifty and more without penalty: smoking in busses is allegedly against the law, and is regularly done. If these seem trifling complaints, we should remind ourselves of two things: they are evidence that the law lies, and therefore is not to be believed; second, that they are a conspicuous illustration to the growing mind that law and order are not to be taken seriously.

The substantial position of the criminal in our national life is described by Daniel P Moynihan in 'The Private Government of Crime' which appeared in the July 6th issue of *The Reporter*. While none of us can be unaware of crime in its personal and anti-social manifestations, the calculated big business which reaches into every area of American life today is less known and more dangerous. The neighborhood delinquent can and should be dealt with. The organized business of crime is far more difficult to reach and has now attained a control of police and courts in some cities. But in both cases a public *will-to-do* is needed which the public has yet to demonstrate. As J Edgar Hoover has pointed out, crime has become everyone's concern, and we will not conquer it by looking the other way.

If the criminal should feel any misgivings about an awakened and resolute public, he may take comfort in the recent dismissals of demonstrably guilty defendants because the evidence against them was obtained by wiretap. One was a narcotics ring caught in flagrante, the evidence dismissed. Assistant District Attorney Irving Langin, stating in General Sessions Court that the defendants 'were guilty beyond any doubt', abandoned the case because prosecution was forbidden to offer wiretap evidence. The presiding judge expressed the hope that Congress might take appropriate measures. A gambling syndicate was shortly thereafter released for the same defect of law.

Now, the point is not whether the ruling in the matter – by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit – that evidence seeking by wiretap is a criminal offence is justified or not. The point is rather that a man is guiltless if his crime *becomes known* in an illegal way. And it is worth notice that there seems to be no corresponding uncertainty about the guilt of those who are endeavoring to protect the public and prosecute the criminal. This indeed is a signal step in our steady progress toward the penalization of the good and desirable citizen, and the reward of the criminal and the delinquent.

Thus we find a concerted support of the criminal mind not only among disinterested citizens, but also among those whose profession makes them the guardians of public virtue and safety: the administrators of justice, the penal officers – the very figures with whom rests the duty of opposing crime and making it vividly unattractive.

A social climate of squeeze, protection, subsidy, handouts and 'welfare' is a fertile ground for crime, for each is a renunciation of moral responsibility and of equitable values and of moral obligation. Here the law abiding citizen has a direct part in the encouragement of his law breaking brother. And if the criminal often comes to manhood unknowing his duties as part of a social order, the real blame must rest with those who do know, but don't want to *do*, who prefer to allow the country to drift on toward chaos rather than see that our degenerating moral fibre is rescued and our government, rehabilitated.

The situation is remediable.

It could be corrected by intelligently conceived and properly applied pressure by those agencies which profess to stand for moral principle such as the National Council of Churches. It has more than passing importance that this body chooses instead to apply itself to the support of such groups as seek the destruction of civilized standards of conduct and orderly processes of law, i e, its apologies for the mobsters who have sought to intimidate Congressional Committees investigating the forces openly avowed to work the destruction of American democracy, and its support of point after point in concert with communism. If such a record could be ignored, we have the further contrast between its trite moralisms on secondary matters and its silence on the important ones to show conclusively that the Council of Churches does not speak for Christian conscience, and that its guiding spirits are either disinclined to take a stand on our national disintegration, or are intimidated by those who seek it.

Every American owes it to himself as a citizen to see the picture which clearly records communist mob violence in action: *Operation Abolition,* and which the National Council has opposed along with the communist fronts. This unmistakable evidence of communist use of force and violence has been certified beyond the evidence of its contents by the irrelevant and even absurd charges of poor editing!

It is refreshing to turn from the shabby record of the National Council to the efforts being made by the Legion of Decency, a butt of ridicule to all those who glory in the present social collapse. This Roman Catholic body is taking emphatic measures against the promotion of crime by our press, radio and cinema, laying it on the line consistently, and enlisting the support of its members who pledge themselves to stand up and oppose the enemy on every count.

A SPACE AGE PRAYER

Let me orbit around
Thee, O Christ
Soul-localized center of me
Thy microcosmic universe.

Thru' the black vastness
Vacuous of good
But light years full
Of unpurified self-will

Let me hurtle towards Thee
Perishing not in friction-fires
Of love-resistance, self-demands
Slowing, retarding the love-flight

Grant me flight free
Thru' the night of perdition
and frigid spaces of
Wightless self-will.

Grant this Thou
Gravitational Pull
And Sun-Center
Of the macro-cosmos!

Far better to be Thine
Sun-satellite, in honest pallor,
Than glow with sham brilliance
Of luciferic suns that flame-out –
unlucky falling stars.

Better far to burn
For Thee, in love
Consumed and consummated,
Sun of love, love's Son –
true homing day-star.

And having been perfected
In plunging pilgrimage
As a burning comet
Guide me to that mansion-world
Where the light years dissolve
Into eternal suns
To rotate devoutly
Amongst the gleeful galaxies
In perpetual orbit
Around the cruciform Son.

– *Fintan Fox, SSB*

Icon of the latest canonized saint of the Greek Church, the late Titular Bishop of Pentapolis, Egypt. Called of God in 1920, St Nektarios was the only Greek saint to have lived into the age of photography. Long venerated as a saint by the faithful, and credited with a number of miraculous cures certified by physicians, the canonization was officially proclaimed by the Ecumenical Patriarch.

(R N S photo)

THE RUSSIAN SECTS

M L James Schrank

When one thinks of Christianity in Russia the first thing that comes to mind is the established Church of the Russion people, the Russian Orthodox Church. Little is known of those Russians who have and are now Christians, but have no affiliation with the religion of the majority.

Though the writer dealt with several books, the vast majority of the information which follows came from the book *Russian Nonconformity*, by Professor Serge Bolshakoff of Oxford University. The debt to that source is so great indeed, that this might be regarded as a book review or condensation of Prof Bolshakoff's book.

On the eve of the Russian Revolution in 1917, there were about twenty-five million Christians who did nor conform to the state Church. Today in the Soviet Union, only ten million of these people survive. According to Prof Bolshakoff, 'Nonconformists are those who refuse to conform to the state-prescribed pattern of religion, and they are by definition champions of religious freedom'.

In 1859 the imperial govern - ment admitted that there may have been 9,300,000 nonconformists instead of the official figure of 829,971. According to Irenarch Parfenov the priestest Old Believers now number about 3,000,000, while the All Soviet Union of the Baptists and Evangelical Christians were counted at 4,000,000 in 1942. Thus there are at least 7,000,000 admitted non-Orthodox Christians with about 3,000,000 more estimated as practicing their religious nonconformity in secret.

Russian nonconformity cannot be appraised in numbers, but rather in influence. Leo Tolstoy had only a few disciples in his native land, but his teachings greatly influenced the great Indian leader, Gandhi. The strange Orthodox mystic, Nilus, publisher of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion confirmed Adolf Hitler in his anti-Jewish and racist views. One could then state with some degree of accuracy that Nilus directly influenced the coming of World War II. The nonconformist Bakunin's violent form of atheism dominated the Bolsheviks in their religious persecutions for years. Also, one cannot overlook Helena Blavatsky, the founder of the Theosophical movement. Though barely known in her own country, she revived an interest in eastern religions in the west. In all, Russian nonconformists produced some fine religious leaders and thinkers. They contributed to the development

of religions thought in Russia and elsewhere.

All those mentioned were Orthodox who rebelled against the Church or against Christianity. If we are to include the Russian Roman Catholics with nonconformists we must not forget the names of Vladimir Soloviev, who greatly influenced Russian religious thought, and Prince Dimitri Golitsyn, the Apostle of the Alleghenies, who was the first Roman Catholic priest to be ordained in the United States.

To make a general observation, we can say that Russian nonconformity was a protest against state intervention in the affairs of the Church. This was so in the case of the Raskol in Muscovy and of the Cossack wars in the Ukraine. The Raskolniks protested against Nikon's reforms imposed by the state. In the case of the Cossacks, they objected to the forcible introduction of the union with Rome in the Ukraine. Today the Russian 'New Nonconformists' (those who today oppose the Patriarchate of Moscow) justify their policy by claiming that the Russian patriarchate is not free, but merely a tool of state intervention in the affairs of the Church.

Russian religious nonconformity has been characterized by being nearly always on the side of democratic ideals, and furthermore being in favor of a free Church in a free state. One can further state that 'nonconformity may be thought of as a natural expression of Slavonic elements in Russian life'. This seems confirmed by the northern origin of nonconformity which flourished greatly among the Slavonic peoples.

Professor Bolshakoff, in evaluating the history of the dissenting Christian movements stated that: 'It has been impossible to suppress freedom of religious expression in Russia. Nonconformist groups, even when persecuted and destroyed officially, have survived and have continued their influence. The story of nonconformity therefore provides one of the most encouraging bases of hope for the future of Christianity in Russia'. This statement provides one with an interesting thought: can religion only survive as a positive force in the absence of absolute conformity?

Early in Russian Christian history, the Novgorodians began to question the dogma of the Church. In the fourteenth century the sect of the *Strigolniks* or 'Barbers' who were spiritual ancestors of the Russian Protestants, questioned the validity of the Orthodox Church. This was the first time that the Church had been questioned in Russia, and this can be looked upon as the beginning of the dissenting groups of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The Strigolniks began because of a feeling among a part of the Russian clergy that it was a sin to charge a fee for ordination and other sacraments. The founder of the sect was a Pskov deacon named Karp, who was also a barber. Thus originated the name 'Strigolnik', the Russian word for barber.

Protesting that the bishops were ordaining priests for money, Karp maintained that such ordinations involved simony and hence were invalid. Karp taught that 'if sacerdotal orders are invalid, it becomes blasphemous to receive sacraments from the clergy'. Thus Karp and his followers left the Church and formed separate communities with their own ministry who were pious laymen who served without pay. The Strigolnik clergy led very simple lives, in contrast to the Orthodox clergy of the time.

This sect considered Orthodox ordinations invalid because of simony, and denied that laymen could perform the sacraments. Thus they abolished all the sacraments except penance. They also sup-

pressed prayers for the dead because they believed that they were not sanctioned by scripture. Their ideal was the early Christian Church, and in accordance with this, they lived fairly puritanical lives. They felt that the ecclesiastical Christianity was 'polluted' and debased, its clergy and faithful pagan, and themselves the elect of God – true 'spiritual Christians'.

The Strigolniks came before the western Reformation, but they were Protestants at heart. They objected to extreme ritualism and to the neglect of the Bible. They also opposed the formalism of the clergy and their moral laxity. They also were very much against the wealth of the upper clergy and of the monasteries, which seemed to them to be unbecoming servants of Christ. Thus we see a correlation between the rise of Protestantism in the west to correct the decline of the then Established Roman Church, and rise of the 'Barbers' to correct the abuses then found in the established Russian Church.

The Strigolniks were in some respects remote forerunners of the Russian Priestless Old Believers of the seventeenth century and of the Russian Evangelicals who crystalized finally into the modern Russian Baptists. This first dissenting sect was never numerous, but they did give a lot of trouble to the Russian bishops. After the two deacons Nicetas and Karp, leaders of the movement were executed in Novgorod in 1375, the sect did manage to survive for awhile. The movement died out very quickly, but survived to a certain extent, as witnessed by the rise of the Judaizers. As all such groups, the Strigolniks performed a useful purpose as they made the Church more aware of its shortcomings.

The *Judaizers* became a powerful force in opposition to the Church. The sect began by the proselytizing activities of one Zechariah, a Lithuanian Jew, who came to Novgorod in 1470. There he converted two priests to Judaism – Dionysius and Alexis. They became his followers. Zechariah thought that they should fulfill the Jewish rites secretly, but avoid circumcision because of the danger of detection. In fact, Zechariah advised both priests to continue to officiate as Orthodox clergy.

These priests taught that the Jewish faith should be observed in its mystical and cabalistic form. They made many converts, and were even patronized by Czar Ivan III. These 'heretics' succeeded in getting one of their own adherents, the Archimandrite Zosima, to the exalted post of Russian primate. The Judaizers even penetrated the court, as Princess Helen, daughter-in-law of Ivan III, was in sympathy with them.

Eventually the Church leaders turned against the Judaizers and burned many of them alive. This brought about their disappearance, but later indications showed that they did not perish completely, but went underground – a standard procedure for dissenting groups throughout Russian history. It is interesting to note that for a long time, it seemed that Muscovy lands would become a Jewish state far from its Mediterranean origins. It seems that this would have completely changed Russian history and would have in fact changed the entire course of world history.

Scholars differ as to what the Judaizers represented. Some believe that they adopted the Jewish creed completely and were therefore Russian Maranos. Others believe that the Judaizers adopted a doctrine combining free-thinking Judaism and Christianity. Basically, they denied the Trinity, the Incarnation and divinity of Christ, awaited another Messiah, observed the Mosaic law, rejected all sacraments, the cult of saints, icons

and relics, the fasts and festivals of the Church, limited their canon of scripture to the Torah, used the Jewish prayer book translated into Slavonic.

Several scholars have maintained that the Judaizers reflected Jewish mysticism and rationalism alike. The heresy of the Judaizers led St Gennadius to complete the translation of the Old Testament into Slavonic. He was, in fact, the major person who combatted the Judaizers.

The controversy among the Russian Church prelates over what to do about the Judaizers led to an open conflict between two opposing groups which ended in the great schism of the Russian Church two hundred years later. The leader of one of the factions was *St Joseph of Volokolamsk*. He led the supporters of Gennadius. This division developed a severe and rigid system of dogma. The other leader of the schism was St Nilus of Sora. He and his followers came to be called *Nonpossessors*, and were more moderate and tolerant than the Josephites. The latter, in fact, favored an Inquisition of the Judaizers, considering them apostates from Christianity.

The 'Elders of the Volga', or the Nonpossessors, believed in the severe punishment of the Judaizers, and even hinted at their complete extermination. Interestingly enough though, this group believed in religious toleration. Paisius Yaroslav was the first head of the Nonpossessors. Later St Nilus of Sora succeeded him. Unlike the Josephites, the Nonpossessors opposed monastic landowning. St Nilus insisted that since monks deny the world, they ought to avoid great estates which would involve them in worldly matters and therefore, corrupt them. He maintained that monks should live in poverty and simplicity, and live by their own labors.

St Nilus, though believing in the necessity of punishing the Judaizers, believed that clemency would be more in the Christian spirit. He stood definitely against capital punishment and furthermore stated that the human conscience should be free. What is also surprising in view of Nilus' attitude toward the Judaizing heresy is that this same man steadfastly maintained that no one ought to be persecuted for his religious views.

A struggle began between the Josephites and the 'Nonpossessors in 1503. It ended with a victory for the Nonpossessors. The Josephites then left the Church with millions of followers, forming the great Russian schism, or Raskol.

THE GREAT RUSSIAN SCHISM

After the disposition of the Metropolitan Barlaam in 1521, the *Josephites* captured the primacy and held it firmly. The Josephites combined extreme ritualism and austere puritanism, holding a literal inspiration of the Bible and of the Church's councilior pronouncements, denying any difference between human and divine elements and any doctrinal development, observing long, severe fasts and complicated ceremonial. They were also champions of the 'Third Rome' concept, were fervent nationalists, and tended to a formalistic and pharisaical religion.

Many scholars have maintained that if the Josephites had been unchecked, they would have created a purely national church similar to that of the Armenians, separate from the Orthodox Church.

The history of the Raskol can be said to have begun in 1652 upon the ascent of Nikon to the Patriarchal throne. He was the greatest primate Russia ever had. Nikon decided to bring the Russian rite nearer to the Greek. The Josephites considered him blasphemous because he sought to reform the Russian

rites, change the Russian sign of the cross, and the Russian way of singing so as to conform with the Greeks. Because of these things, the Josephites declared him a heretic.

A struggle between Nikon and the extreme Josephites led by the Archpriest Neronov at first, and they by Avvakum, led to a permanent rift. No schism might have occurred if Nikon had been more tactful. He ordered the liturgical reforms in a harsh and uncompromising manner upon the unwilling clergy and people. Many peasants left the Church, but Nikon was supported by Czar Alexis, the prelates, court officers, nobles and many of the lower clergy. Nikon excommunicated all those who opposed his reforms. Those that left the Church were led by the Archpriest Avvakum, a typical Josephite, who regarded everything Russian as sacred and perfect. What was surprising was that even though this period was the time of much internal dissention, the patriarchate under Nikon enjoyed its greatest power and prestige.

The Raskol believed that Moscow like Rome and Constantinople had become heretical. 'Thus the last Christian kingdom in the world had disappeared'. The Raskolniks awaited, therefore, the end of the world, and expected the Second Advent. They believed that the world would end in 1669, and they neglected their businesses and spent their time in fasting and prayer to prepare for the event. Nothing happened then, as did nothing in 1699, the new calculation for the end of the world. Believing that Czar Peter the Great was the AntiChrist, many Raskolniks decided to burn themselves alive. Thousands perished in this self-inflicted auto-da-fe.

The Raskolniks were termed the *Old Believers*. Not a single bishop joined them, and this created the problem of a clergy, as there were no bishops to ordain new priests. The moderate Raskolniks solved this difficulty by accepting as priests any Russian Church priest who denied the 'Nikonian Heresy'. These moderates were mainly from central Russia and became known as the Popovtsky – the Priestists. They finally settled in Poland, but their community at Vetka was destroyed in 1764 in the reign of Catherine II. The center of the Priestist movement was thus transferred to Starodubie, Irgiz, and then to Moscow itself.

The Priestists divided into several tolki or sects because of the differences in the manner of accepting Orthodox priests into their communities. Some Raskolniks came back into the Church, forming the Edinovertsy parishes. These, however, were looked upon as second-class Orthodox Christians. The Edinovertsy movement grew steadily until 1917, they numbered 2,000 parishes all over the Russian Empire. It is estimated that each diocese had at the minimum 30 parishes. Altogether, there were about two million of them in 1917.

Very solemn ancient rites were celebrated in Edinovertsy parishes. In 1918, Patriarch Tikhon consecrated the Edinovertsy Archpriest S Shleev as Bishop of Okhta. Since that time the Edinivertsy have had their own bishops.

The success and toleration of the Priestists was due to the fact that the social and economic position of the Orthodox clergy during the eighteenth century was not high. Thus many Russian priests were willing to join the Raskolniks. The social status of the clergy was low, and many priests, not liking the subservience of the Church to the state and detesting the 'Protestantizing and deistic tendencies' of the rulers, joined the Priestists.

Beginning with the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855) the Raskolniks' position declined. Nicholas

believed that they were breeding grounds for political radicalism. Also, at this time, the position of the Orthodox clergy improved. Because of all this the Priestists found it hard to obtain clergy for their parishes and monasteries. To add to their problems the government began to close down monasteries and parishes and to arrest nonconformist clergy. To solve the tremendous shortage of clergy the Priestists created their own hierarchy.

Realizing that Nicholas I would never allow a new Priestist hierarchy in Russia, they decided to establish the hierarchy outside of Russia, and chose the monastery of Bela Krynitsa in Austrian Bukovina. A small community of the descendants of Priestist fugitives from Russia lived in this area. Metropolitan Ambrosius of Bosna-Sarajevo became the first primate of this Church in 1846. Gradually, Russian prelates were consecrated and ten regular dioceses were established in Russia. Thus the dependence of the Russian Priestists upon the Russian Orthodox for clergy ended.

At the present time the Priestists seem to be drawing closer to the Orthodox Church, although the Russian Church has not accepted the validity of the Priestist order. Today, the Edinovertsy form a bridge between the Church and the Raskol. All Raskolniks today have been absorbed by the Edinoverie or by the Priestist Church.

The extreme Raskolniks, unlike the Moderates, did not accept the validity of the Nikonian orders. They considered the Russian Church heretical. Once the pre-Nikonian priests died, the priesthood would be at an end, according to this group. The Priestless accordingly abandoned all the sacraments except baptism. Thus Avvakum and his followers actually founded the *Bezpopovtsy*, or the Priestless.

Twenty thousand of this branch of the Raskolniks burned themselves alive in the seventeenth century preferring 'self-immolation to eternal damnation'. Peter the Great took pity upon these ignorant people and allowed them to observe their rites and customs, provided that they would pay a special tax, wear a special garb, and not proselytize. Peter allowed the Priestless to organize, and they established themselves in northern Russia. The Novgorodian lands where the Priestless settled was always short of clergy. The northern laymen, thus, usually baptized, confessed their sins to each other, and buried their own dead. There were few churches in this remote area, so most people rarely went to church, going instead to the village chapel, where laymen conducted all services that the laity were permitted to conduct. To the northern Russian, therefore, the Priestless doctrine and practice was not found to be so unusual. Also, the Nonconformists had always found refuge in the north. Another reason for the success of the Priestless in Novgorodian lands was that this area was always subject to Swedish Protestant influences.

Monastic orders dedicated to a completely separate Raskolnik organization were founded apart from the Orthodox Church. Around the monastery on the river Vyg, Priestless communities grew up, similar to the later Soviet collectivized villages. These people gradually became known as the Shore Dwellers. They advocated the doctrine of the internal temple of the soul. The Shore Dwellers' liturgy included all services that were allowed to laymen in the Church. They elected certain laymen to act as teachers and ministers. The teachers were similar to the rabbis in post-Biblical Judaism. Several sects emerged from this group over the problems of marriage and relations

with the state and society at large.

The Shore Dwellers were originally quite radical, but in time settled down and became a sect of well-to-do peasants and merchants. They became law-abiding and even supported the government. Originally, opposing marriage, they accepted matrimony as part of their teachings in 1765. Many of them later joined the Priestists or Edinovertsy. In 1863, it was estimated that there were two million Shore Dwellers, but from then on they began to decline.

After the Shore Dwellers began to make peace with the state, the more radical of the Priestless combined to form extremist sects. For awhile the *Theodosians,* founded by Theodosius Vasiliev, were the most radical of the Priestless.

The Theodosians accepted marriage, but would not pray for the imperial regime or the Empress Anna, both of which they considered to be Antichrist. This group did not believe in obeying the laws of the state, and championed separate communities, so as to have little or no contact with the heretics. Later, the Theodosians repudiated marriage. This led to a new sect of those who dissented from the new laws. The latter group was termed the Newly Married. The Theodosians continued to divide into sects. In 1863, it was estimated that there were about one million people included within these dissenters. They all decreased in the years following, and it is believed that the Soviet Revolution wiped them out completely, as among this type group were included the Russian bourgeoisie and the well-to-do peasants.

The *Philippians* were a radical group named after their founder, Philip, a Vyg monk. They did not differ much from the Theodosians. The differences were that the Philippians were completely opposed to any cooperation with the civil authorities. This group also imposed strict lifelong celibacy, which the Theodosians did not. The Philippians are almost extinct today.

The *Wanderers* were founded by Euphemius, a member of the Philippians. This church leader believed that one must avoid any contact with the satanic society (i e the state). Euphemius maintained that a true Christian must avoid any contact with the damned. He forbid his followers to take any certificate of identity, to pay taxes, or to become soldiers. The group believed that he who wants to be a Christian or Strannik (Wanderer) must die to the world, baptizing himself in a river by triple immersion. He then had to become a pilgrim, travelling from place to place, avoiding any contact with state agents, whom they considered to be the servants of Antichrist.

There were two groups of Wanderers – those who went from place to place, and those who remained at home. The Wanderers were highly individualistic, recognizing no authority, and were perfect anarchists. Gregory Rasputin, interestingly enough, lived as a Wanderer at one time in his life. The Wanderers eventually settled down, and turned into well-to-do people who never wandered. They did try to die in their gardens, so that they could say that they had not left home.

In all, there were approximately 130 different Raskol sects in Russia in 1870. As a reaction to this, the Convention of the Saviour – Spasovo Soglasie – made its appearance. It opposed all other Priestless groups and denied that a layman could baptize or perform any sacrament at all. The Saviourites believed that all sacraments performed by laymen were invalid and blasphemous. This group also stated that since Antichrist now ruled the world, saving grace is

lost. The age of sacraments and public worship, thus, were gone forever. The only way to salvation which God has left stated the Saviourites, was in direct union with him through prayer. This sect believed that a Christian must surrender his complete life to the Saviour. The Saviourites based their lives and conduct, like the Quakers, on the inner voice and divine inspiration.

The Priestless moved farther away from the established Church each year, becoming steadily more radical and eventually abandoning everything of the Orthodox faith. After the Soviet Revolution the Priestless became religiously indifferent or accepted Marxism-Leninism. Over the years, the Priestless changed their doctrine and practice. From being very ritualistic, they eventually gave up everything except private prayer. From the most rigid fundamentalists, they came to base their religion solely upon direct inspiration. The many sects, doctrinal indifferences and the absence of a strong organization proved unable to survive the Soviet Revolution. There were three million in 1859, and probably numbered eight million in 1879. From then on the movement dwindled and is virtually extinct today.

The Khlysty were founded by a peasant by the name of Daniel Filipov in 1631 who proclaimed himself to be God who had come to give the world twelve new commandments. Filipov appointed another peasant, Ivan Suslov, to act as Christ. He in turn appointed a woman to be 'our Lady', and also named twelve apostles. These 'people of God', as they styled themselves, danced, jumped, prophesied, rejected baptism by water and tolerated extramarital relations.

After persecution in the first half of the eighteenth century the group went underground. It later rejected its original belief that learning was useless. A later 'Christ', Avvakum Kopylov, introduced the rites of penance and baptism. From this sect a new movement was established which called itself the 'New Israel'. This movement was believed to be the direct descendant of the earlier heresies of the Strigolniks and the Judaizers.

Another more radical sect came out of the Khlysty movement in the late nineteenth century which termed itself the 'Old Israel'. Its leader for awhile was the 'Christ' Alexis Stchetinin, who as the other leaders, was a peasant. This group believed that sin was needed in order to attain salvation. They proposed the complete destruction of everything holy and beloved by man, and the equalization of everyone in sin. Stchetinin believed that the more he suffered because of much sinning, the greater the man's salvation and future happiness. He thus advocated the necessity of sin, and rejected marriage, parenthood, and friendship. Stchetinin practiced and taught immorality. Gregory Rasputin, confidant of the Romanovs, knew this cultist and practiced his teachings.

The last Khlysty sect came into being around 1900 in St Petersburg, centered strangely enough around the famous Father John of Kronstadt in 1908. Some of his devotees believed that he was a 'Christ', a holy man and miracle worker. The group came to be called the 'Ioannity'. It was opposed to the Bolsheviks, but managed to survive the Revolution.

The Khlysty was never numerous, embraced about 65,000 in 1880, and began to decline after that year. The older groups moderated in both doctrine and practice. They again came to accept the authority of the Bible and recognized marriage. Today this group is known as the Pentecostal Christians.

The Khlysty sects varied somewhat in their teachings but seem to have shared a broad attachment to an amalgam of ancient gnosticism and modern rationalism which was modalist, unitarian, adoptionist, pantheistic, and pelagian with theosophical undertones – i e, they seem to have regarded Christ as but one of several divine manifestations, and believed in trans migration. Also like the gnostics, they appear to have included in their ranks both extreme puritans and devotees of evil for its own sake.

What was essential, though, to Khlysty thought was the belief that God himself spoke to man, lived in man, and is incarnated in him. There was no possibility of a union of two natures in man. God was said to inhabit the body but was not united with it. Every man was his own saviour, and could become 'Christ' by his own personal efforts. They were congregational in spirit, as each group was completely independent. There were two different services. Regular services were held along Protestant lines, but secret services were also held which were somewhat like the 'Holy Rollers'. Interestingly enough, they remained devout members, outwardly, of the Church!

The Khlysty proved unable to live by the rigid sexual abstinence laws. Conrad Selivianov, one of their number, was horrified by the contradiction between their doctrine and their immoral life. He maintained that man could not live chastely just by an effort of the will, and advocated castration. Eventually he was arrested for his propagandizing and sentenced to life imprisonment in Siberia. Later this sect leader claimed that he was the murdered husband of Catherine the Great, Czar Peter III. He was brought to St Petersburg, and eventually allowed a great deal of freedom. Selivianov, once free again, renewed his missionary work. His followers became known as *Skoptsy,* or Castrates, but the group itself preferred to be known as the 'People of God' or 'White Doves' (Belye Golubi). Selivianov, again around the early nineteenth century, began his program of mass castration, was again imprisoned for his activities and died there reconciled with the Church.

The Skoptsy, although numbering less than 100,000 at its peak, spread all over Russia, and established a Russian group in Rumania. They agreed with the doctrine of the Khlysty except in regard to the need for castration in order to attain salvation. The Skoptsy maintained that all the saints and just of the Old Testament ended their lives as Skoptsy, and even went so far as to claim that Jesus was castrated by John the Baptist, and he in turn, castrated all his apostles save Judas! They agreed with the Khlysty in denying that Jesus suffered on the cross, and maintained that he died a natural death.

Another sect of the time of Alexander I was that of the 'Spiritual Union' led by Catherine Tatarinov, a woman of Russian society, who was associated with Selivianov. This group mingled bits of Khlysty, German Pietist, Masonic and Orthodox thought and practice. It had little power or lasting influence in Russian life. In the last analysis, we can say that the sects of the Khlysty type had little following and did not influence Russian history or life to any great extent.

THE PROTESTANT SECTS

Many people, when the Khlysty and Skoptsy were at their peak, became interested in the doctrine of the inner guiding light and the indwelling of God in the soul. They were not able, however, to bring themselves to join any of the

Khlysty or Skoptsy groups because of these groups' extreme viewpoints and practices. The mysticism of the 'inner light' developed secretly in Russia all during the eighteenth century, and eventually the Dukhobors or 'Wrestlers with the Spirit' appeared. This sect first appeared in the Ukraine, and was largely influenced by the teachings of the Khlysty, Protestantism and Freemasonry.

Unorthodox Protestant thinkers such as Matthew Bashkin, Matthew the Pharmacien, Andrew Khoteev and Dimitri Tveritinov, who leaned toward Unitarianism, influenced Dukhobor thought. And the influence can be seen in the messianic claims of several Dukhobor leaders. As they were forced by the government to live apart from the Orthodox, they set uo communistic societies.

A group within the Dukhobors were the Verigin who were influenced by Tolstoy and believed in nonresistance to evil and denied the right of private property, and the state's right to register vital information. As a whole the Dukhobors believed with Tolstoy that Christ was a mere moral teacher and no dogmatist, divine in his mind which is the same as in all men that there is no personal immortality but only mankind is immortal because the 'eternal mind' dwells in it, and that to live rationally is to live in God, to live eternally.

In 1898-1899 Peter Verigin, the last leader or 'petuishka' was allowed to migrate to Canada along with 7,400 of his group. Their anarchistic views and practices have led to much conflict between them and the Canadian government. Today there are said to be about 17,000 Dukhobors in Canada divided into three main groups – those who continue to follow the old tradition: those who have 'compromised with the world': and those who are almost communist. It has been predicted that the moderate or Independent Dukhobors may join the United Church of Canada as a group, as some individual members have done. At the present time the remaining Dukhobors in Russia are affiliated with the Pentecostalists.

The Dukhobors proclaimed their confession of faith for the first time in 1791, asserting that the only source of doctrine is the living tradition in their sect and that it is derived from Christ himself, having been handed down from one generation to another.

The Dukhobors attached very little importance to the Bible as such. They maintained that it could be understood only with the inner light that comes from God. Their theology in general is unitarian and pantheistic, modalist, likening the aspects of the godhead to light, life and peace, arian and pelagian, and given to allegorical exegesis of a rationalistic kind.

THE MOLOKANS

A dissenting Dukhobor group was founded by Simeon Uklein, son-in-law of an early Dukhobor leader which took a somewhat more conservative attitude toward scripture, rejected allegorical interpretation, held a subordinationist trinitarianism, a docetist Christology, and admitted a limited obedience to the secular law if it agreed with their convictions. Uklein introduced Mosaic dietary laws, abolished Christian fasts, rejected all sacraments and church ritual. His followers acquired the name 'milk drinkers' from doing so during Lent when it was forbidden by the Orthodox Church. All of this showed that the Judaizers had not disappeared in Russia. In fact, in 1796, six villages professed Judaism. From then on, it spread all over Russia, though never gaining much importance or influence.

From the Molokans there arose a group which believed that Judaism was above Christianity, that Christ was an ordinary Jew and, in fact,

inferior to Moses. They observed Jewish feasts and rites and united with a sect called the Subbotniks who descended from the earlier Judaizers. In 1880 it was estimated that they comprised a little more than three thousand persons. A group of Caucasian Subbotniks keep the Sabbath, observe the Mosaic laws and many rabbinical prayers. Their liturgy is that of the Russian Jews, except that the language of prayer is Russian.

Another group of radical Judaizers known as the *Gerui* are Russians by race, but Jewish in religion, having Jewish rabbis, praying in Hebrew, living according to the rabbinical law and looking for the coming of the Messiah.

COMMUNAL MOLOKANS

These people opposed the Judaistic elements of some of the Molokans. They were known as *Voskresniks,* or Sunday Observers. The Communal Molokans were the only Russian sect to reject the principle of private judgment and the unrestricted and unrestrained interpretation of Holy Scripture. They elected one man in whom they vested sole authority to interpret the Bible. Anyone who differed with the opinion of this 'judge' was expelled from the sect.

The Jumpers were a group which broke away from the Communal Molokans because they disliked the oligarchy of their parent group. They returned to the older Khlysty ritual of sacred dancing and prophesying, and revived the Khlysty office of 'Christ', renaming it 'czar'. This group survived the Revolution of 1917, and is now affiliated with the Pentecostalists.

The Evangelical Christians or 'Tolk' were another group that arose within the Molokan movement They are close to the Baptists in many respects, but retain their own identity. After the Baptists they are the most numerous of the Russian Protestants today. They have many churches in the Soviet Union as well as in Manchuria and the United States. Their present membership is estimated at approximately one million.

ESCHATOLOGICAL SECTS

Several sects arose in Russia that were close to the Molokans in ideology. They included *The Fraternity of the Just,* which was founded by Nicholas Ilun in the mid-nineteenth century : the *Enochians,* which began in the late nineteenth century as a result of the teachings of a peasant named Andrew Cherkasov : the Malevantsy which was founded by a Baptist named Conrad Malevannyi. All these sects were eschatological and expected the coming of the Messiah. The Fraternity of the Just was communist, puritanical, unitarian, non-ritualist and anticlerical. The Enochians, another interesting group, still exist. Their most interesting characteristic is that they await the end of the world.

RUSSIAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY

The Baptists are the closest to Western Protestants in doctrine and practice. They exist in the Soviet Union today.

The bases of the Russian Baptists were the Stundists and the Molokans. The Stundists were of German origin, and settled in what has become known as the Soviet German Republic. In 1941 these Volga Germans were deported to central Asia where they continue to reside according to latest information. Most of the Germans in Russia were members of small Protestant sects such as the Mennonites and Nazarenes. These people were allowed to settle in Russia, but were forbidden to proselytize. However in 1867 a pastor of the Nazarene community began to propagandize and thus began Russian Stundism. The activities of this pastor led newly converted peasants to stop

attending Orthodox services and instead met with one another in private houses for services. This type of meeting was called 'Stunden', or 'Hours', by the German Pietists, hence the name Stundists. Their doctrines are conventionally Protestant and puritan.

Russian Baptist groups also appeared in Tiflis, Georgia, and in St Petersburg. They were persecuted by the government which tolerated their proselytizing among the Molokans, but would not permit it among Orthodox. The regime intended that the solidarity of the Church be maintained as an element in national unity: Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationalism.

In 1914 the Russian Baptist Union claimed 97,000 members, while the Union of Evangelical Christians, itself headed by a Baptist leader, Ivan Prokhanov, claimed 8,500 adherents. Following the Soviet capture of the government, the Protestants prospered. Because they had no endowments, monasteries, seminaries, elaborate hierarchical organization or ritual, they did not suffer from the persecution that the Church encountered. These sects were even favored by the government which wished to weaken the Church, looking upon it as one of the vestiges of Czarism.

To understand the Soviet Union's original support of the dissenting groups we can ponder the statement issued at the Twelfth All-Union Congress of the Communist Party: 'We must pay the greatest attention to the sectarians, who under the czarist regime suffered persecutions and some of whom are very active. By assuming a reasonable attitude toward them we must win over their most energetic and cultured elements to serve our purpose. Considering the great number of sectarians, this is a matter of utmost importance. The problem must be solved according to local conditions.'

In subsequent years the Union of the Evangelical Christians grew until in 1922 they numbered over 250,000. They were still unable, though, to come to terms with the All Russia Baptist Union. In 1928 the Evangelicals numbered 3,219 congregations with over four million communicants. The next year the Soviet government turned against this group and tried to stifle their progress. The regime was quite successful at this, as seen in the fact that the Evangelicals had only 1,000 congregations left in 1940.

It was not until 1944 that the two groups of Russian Baptists were united. This merger became the Council of the United Baptists and the Evangelical Christians and was joined in 1945 by the Pentecostals, or Spiritual Christians, which was a loose association of many sects including the Jumpers, Rollers, Dukhobors, Judaizers and Khlysty. The federation became known as the Council of the United Baptists, Evangelical Christians, and Pentecostal Churches and groups in the U S S R.

Today the Baptists form the main group of Russian Protestants and are nearest to American Protestantism. In 1947 there were 4,000 Baptist and Evangelical congregations in the U S S R. Four hundred thousand people were listed on the church roles, but over four million were known to attend its services. In addition there are probably underground groups which would be classified as Protestant.

THE RUTHENIAN UNIATS

Although one cannot really include the history of the Uniats or any other Roman Catholic group along with the dissenting groups of the Russian Church, one can in a sense look upon them as groups which dissented from the established Church by choosing to worship in a different manner from the

majority

The Ruthenian Uniats refer to those who were at times within the Roman Church, at times independent, and at times in Orthodoxy. The Ruthenian Uniats, as the name implies, are those who had their origins in West Russia including Lithuania, the Ukraine and Poland.

The Ruthenians or West Russians were more receptive to the Act of Union of Florence in the fifteenth century than were the Muscovites. Originally Orthodox, the Ruthenians allied themselves with Rome in 1595, but continued to preserve their own rites and organization. This became known as the Union with Rome of 1595. During the seventeenth century a long struggle began between the Orthodox and the Uniats for control of the Ruthenian Church. The Uniats were winning out until Orthodoxy in Poland was saved from extinction by the Ukrainian Cossacks. Their success can be seen in the fact that in 1764 there were four million Uniats in Poland but only six hundred thousand Orthodox. The partitions of Poland were responsible for the return of all the Ruthenians to Russia, and thereby to the Russian sphere of influence. Because of this, and largely due to the work of Archbishop George Konissky of White Russia, over two million Uniats rejoined the Church in 1796. Another reunion of the Uniats with the Church took place in 1839 in Polotsk. At that time 1,607 parishes totaling 1,600,000 people rejoined the Mother Church.

After 1839 only one Uniat diocese remained in all of Russia. That was the diocese of Kholm in Russian Poland. This diocese was reunited with the Church in 1875. Those priests who dissented at that time fled to Austria, the last refuge of the Ruthenian Uniats. The Uniats were able to survive in Austrian Galicia where two bishops of that group were made cardinals. Here the Uniats survived into the twentieth century. In 1945, however, the Bolsheviks arrested and deported all seven Uniat bishops because they identified this Church with Ukrainian nationalists, who were allies of the Nazis. After this, a movement was begun to unite the Galician Uniats with the Church. Led by Dr Kostelnik, 997 Galician Uniat priests out of the 1,270 supported this reunification move. By 1949, not one church remained Uniat; all had returned to Orthodoxy.

The only remnant of the Ruthenian Uniats today exists outside the U S S R – in Czechoslovakia and the United States. Though most remain subject to Rome, some have returned to Orthodoxy. In this country the Roman Church now claims 300,000 to 400,000.

Only the expert can venture to predict the future. In retrospect we can say that the dissenting movements did play a great part in the history of Russia and of Russian Christianity. We can profit by realizing that freedom of expression is vital to preserve a society from stagnation. It might even be said that the degree of religious freedom and expression can well be the mirror of the strength and progress of that civilization. If truth is to survive it must be allowed to have a place on the battlefield for ideas. Inherited truths which are not given an opportunity to prove themselves too often stagnate into ancient prejudices.

Not being of the Orthodox faith nor affiliated with any groups mentioned in this review, one may perhaps make some objective comments. First, the extremes of the sects can teach us the danger of extremism. And secondly is the lesson that tolerance must be the goal of all, both of the conforming and of the conforming alike.

RETURN TO SANITY

Alexander Turner, SSB

Three once-potent myths are dying in our time and few Christians will lament their end. The first said that man was sufficient unto himself; the second, that nature was the all-in-all, the whole show; the third, that God was a sort of happy thought whose chief function was to serve as a symbolic reminder of our duties, or of an inevitable, inescapable, happy ending.

Some unthinking people will still say with an air of inspired finality that it matters nothing what a man believes if only he is loving and dutiful. Many others, who might once have said so, have changed their minds. It makes much difference to a traveler whether he believes his destination is east or west.

Skeptics have used every device to imply that Christ was anything but what he professed to be: that he was a great moral example, a teacher or a prophet. This is silly. A moral example does not misrepresent himself as the messiah and command men to follow him personally in complete self-surrender.

To accept the great teacher theory we must first of all deny that he was an imposter, deny that he was deluded, and accept his teaching credentials. Having done that all is well until we examine what he taught. He taught, in the idiom of his times, that he was the anointed, the Son of God, the messiah.

If we reread the New Testament with a sense of its Old Testament background and mores, we shall realize how preeminent this doctrine is. A people who lived in darkness awoke to see a great light; God, who had been a ruler, became a Father; the exile of mankind was terminated by the Bearer of good tidings; God became man that man might become God.

That is the epitome of the whole thing. But it was abundantly clear that God was running the show, that atonement was to be on his terms, and that it was to be achieved by visible signs such as baptism and laying on of hands. This has given offence to many modern Christians. In everything else we are expected to accord the physical a preeminent and final place. Can you see a

thing, weigh it, taste it? If not, it can't be very important, even if it does exist. 'Take care of this world and the next will take care of itself.' So sang the psalmists of modernism.

Thus with one heresy man shut himself tightly up in his own tiny world and with a second he locked the creator out. It is a unique order of intellectual hypocrisy which can say in one breath that this world is all that matters, and in the next, that the spiritual would be contaminated by contact with it!

When one denies any importance to the spiritual except as it is justified by observation, one is denying its existence, for anything which exists has some importance. From that to atheism is a very short step, and there are many Christian clergymen who have taken it. The future will well remember what an eloquent epitaph Protestantism wrote for itself! Some unhappy souls who placed progress above faith are now experiencing a change of outlook. But it is small credit to them that, having staged such a ridiculous demarche around Robin Hood's barn, they now look back only because they are summoned by a science which is much less dogmatically materialistic than they.

There are probably two important lessons to be drawn from this. The first is that religion is not a fit subject for improvisation. The second is that nature's finished products are more spiritually significant than her raw materials. There must be some point where this world and the next are contiguous. It is unlikely that we shall find it in the neutron any more than we found materialism proved by evolution. Let us look instead to those who have some just claim to knowing about such matters – the saints and the sages and prophets whose lives were their own testimony to a more basic reality.

Something formal is expected of us. It is slight, but we do have the responsibility. We must only say Amen, but we must do it with all our heart and mind and soul and body. There is no room between man and God for politeness; there is no time for temporizing, no place in the Church for dabbling. Every minute of man's life is fraught with an awful urgency, for every minute is a little slice of time which can never be recalled. Only its decision or indecision returns with compound interest to remind us how far we have traveled – and in what direction.

Perhaps this is a disquieting thought. But no one knows serenity until he has transcended disquiet. To bring unity to the dispersed and harmony to the disturbed is one purpose of the Church. Unless we

lift up our eyes to the hills and recognize the only source of peace and the one center of unity, we shall certainly place our trust amiss.

Yes, men are looking in a different direction today than they did fifty years ago. It has been a slow process, it is often oblique, indirect and hesitant. But those who have walked the same way in ages past from skepticism to Christian faith have finally come to that plenitude of doctrine which is preserved only in the Church, and to that certitude and reassurance which the Church alone can give.

We cannot recognize our Church for what it is without confidently looking forward to the time when it will be spread abroad throughout the land. The signs are clear. A new breath is stirring. Those who lament the evident mistakes of the past look for a new assurance and promise. Ornamental worship and the ancient Christian ceremonies are found unexpectedly in those churches where they were recently condemned. A more mature theological outlook is being born in the minds of western thinkers. But all these externals will never save the soul of a flea, and against the greatest of them there is an indellible minus sign, for each is a reminder of life which has past, like the garments of a dear one now gone to glory. The externals of the Church are that bread by which alone man cannot live, yet which, by God's grace can become the veritable Body of Christ incarnate in the world.

That brings us back to a distasteful subject: institutionalism, For many of us, organization in the Church has seemed like a fate worse than death. No doubt it will be the last hurdle for the dissenting mind. If we are frank enough we shall eventually see that our reserve toward the tangibles of religion is essentially a form of materialism. And if we look deep enough into our souls we shall see that resentment of church order is at bottom the pride of self, the resentment of discipline.

Yet this cuts very close to the core of Christianity as a religion, the great mystery and grand promise whereby we can say truly that our Lord is with us to the end of time, that we are one in him and through him with our fellow-man. In that unity there can be no aloofness from him or from the ordained means of his hospitality.

Adversity would seem to be the only stabilizing force in history, for it is only when our complacency and pride are shattered that we must face up to our folly. The last time we nearly lost the works. After the next, we shall not have another chance. And yet there are few of us who will frankly admit by what a slender thread western civiliza-

zation is now suspended. It is more fun to watch television than to play Church because God will not enter into the spirit of the game. And there is also a disquieting possibility that he just could turn up in the flesh. That would be awkward indeed because things would then go his way and he would not be democratic about it!

We Christians can take our choice. We can go away mad because the game isn't being played by our rules. We do that when we say that God can't do this or that because it is disagreeable to us – that he could not permit us to reap the fruit of our own ill deeds, for example, or that he couldn't have made the world because we would have done it differently.

On the other hand, we can accept the rules as they stand and play the game like adults. In that case we can expect no choirs of angels to laud our heroism. The rules really mean what they say and the rewards are solely spiritual.

If you do not believe this you will find it naive. If you do believe it and stop to think what it means, you will find it shocking. But in either case the early Christians were not afraid of facing the facts, unpleasant as they sometimes appeared.

There is not a Christian who would not throw his inhibitions to the winds and shout from the housetops if he knew the second advent had occurred. Now, so far as you and I are concerned, there is just as much to tell others at this very moment as there would be if the second advent *had* occurred. We face the same awful realities of our own condition and of the hereafter. Our means of grace and hope of glory are the same today as they were 2000 years ago. Only a few years separate us from the full cognizance of God's being and from our own value in his infinite scale of values. The only difference is that we must now make an effort to see what we shall sometime be unable to escape. In fact the real point of our being is apparently the evocation within us of that supernatural recognition.

Why then are we so restrained? If we knew that some mad genius had lighted a short fuse to a super atomic-hydrogen-cobalt nightmare which would blow us to hell in twenty minutes, we should stop our bowing and scraping and get on with the business.

There are ignorant Christians; but there are really no indifferent Christians. The point being that we profess things which we do not fully believe. What we describe as indifference is usually a defect of knowledge or of understanding, not a defect of will. We are never in-

different to our own interests, though we are frequently uncertain as to where our interests lie.

For many American Christians the articles of faith have become a picturesque and endearing fiction. They do not stand for matters of life and death. Hence they are not what they claim to be. That state is the final disintegration of religion. It is the end of a process which begins with much earlier doubts.

Thoughts for the Praying Church

Oremus

Compiled by Augustine Grove, SSB

Love makes man equal to God, and God wants us to love him in order that we may be equal to him and share his nature and all his infinite goodness and joy. God wants us to love him beyond measure, because then he can give himself to us beyond measure...We are perfectly ourselves only when we have lost ourselves in this pure love of God for his own sake; and God calls us to him in order to transform us into love. God loves us that we may learn to love him. – Thomas Merton

Splendid and holy causes are served by men who are themselves splendid and holy. – Padraic Pearse

Joy is the echo of God's life within us. – Joseph Marmion

God writes straight with crooked lines. – Portuguese proverb

Christianity has not been tried and found wanting, it has been tried and found hard.
– Gilbert Keith Chesterton

A practicing Christian who asks whether he has time for prayer is like a carpenter asking whether he has time to sharpen his tools.
– Douglas V Steere

Silence is as full of potential wisdom and wit as the unhewn marble of great sculpture. – Aldous Huxley

God works in silence. The spirit of the world, which is selfishness and envy and conspiracy and lust and terror, makes men loud from the fear of their own hollowness. But the Spirit of God gives them peace, teaches them not to be afraid of silence, but to find themselves in quiet. – Thomas Merton

When we have a friend, the friend's life is in our keeping, in a deeper sense than we dream. We must beware that never by a word, by a touch, by an act, by an influence, we harm or weaken our friend's life or misdirect him. – J R Miller

Most of the misery in the world is caused by being unkind to those who live with us. – George Hoffman

Beauty is the splendor of truth.
– Plato

THE TRAGEDY OF MOUNT ATHOS

Ivan Michaelson Czap

Mount Athos, a peninsula in Southern Greece, in the old kingdom of Macedonia, has been an Orthodox monastic retreat for almost two thousand years. It has hundreds of sketes, kelliyi, and monasteries and the twenty ruling monasteries. It has never been known as Serbian, Bulgarian, Moldavian, Greek or Russian. But it has always been a stronghold of traditional, non-nationalistic Orthodoxy, embracing persons of every nationality and from every country.

Saints of every nationality, venerated by Orthodox churches in every country, have lived and prayed there. Mount Athos is the Holy Mountain of *all* Orthodoxy.

It is a place of constant, unceasing prayer. It is a center of Orthodox spirituality. People from all over the world have come, some to remain as monks, others to pray and make their pilgrimage to this Holy Land whose protectress is the Mother of God. It is a marvelously verdant peninsula where any person, dedicating his life to contemplation and spiritual works may find haven.

At one time over 30,000 monks were there. They came from every walk of life, every condition – rich and poor alike – all joined in a life of dedication to their common faith. From Mount Athos prayerful influences extend to all of us, all over the world. The charities, the good works of the Athonite monks have, over many centuries, given lasting benefits to all people.

But the monks of Slav extraction of Russian background (whose motherland, when it was Holy Russia, always extended a helping hand) have met adversities in this center of Orthodoxy. Adversities have also befallen the Serbian, the Bulgarian, and the Rumanian monasteries. Their old homelands, occupied by atheistic powers, are not interested in helping those who pray for us. But we in America are free, can show our concern, and can offer active help, prayers and encouragement.

What has been happening on Mount Athos? Recent fires have destroyed lives, buildings, and religious treasures. Tourists come in large numbers – mostly non-Orthodox – encouraged by the official Greek Tourist Office. But pilgrims and monks meet delays, and are discouraged from coming.

Official restrictions have reduced the number of monks. Now only the aged remain, some over 80 years old. New monks of Slav background were forbidden entry for almost a quarter of a century. Now at last – almost too late – they may apply! In those years fewer and fewer Greeks applied; and even fewer remained in this dedicated vocation. Other conditions interrupt the monks' rounds of prayer, their intercessions. It is beyond my

power to describe briefly the difficulties they must endure to carry on these holy traditions, which, over the centuries, have benefitted mankind.

It is hard to understand (or is it?) why the Greek government which promotes tourism there, is doing nothing to encourage the traditional monastic life on Athos. Mt Athos is not Greek. The peninsula is an independent, self-governing monastic land. Contact with the Greek government is through the Greek Department of Foreign Affairs.

In 1923 the Greek government promised to preserve the traditional (all-national) Orthodox character of Athos. In the Treaty of Lausanne, the solemnly signed guarantee was as follows: 'Greece is obligated to recognize and preserve the traditional liberties and privileges (which the non-Greek monastic establishments enjoy) in accordance with the provisions contained in Article 62 of the Berlin Treaty of July 13, 1878'. The Berlin Treaty, in Article 62, had this provision: 'The Monks of Athos, whatever be their origin, shall preserve their former possessions and advantages, and shall enjoy without any exception full equality of rights and privileges'.

Faithful Orthodox of every nationality – Greek, Serbian, Russian and American, have a right to call on Greece to abide by the promises. Moreover, Greece is an Orthodox country; we are calling on brother-Orthodox to help their faith, the same faith of us all.

We call on the Greek faithful, civil officials, the Church hierarchy and laymen to stand firmly in Orthodoxy and help the monks and monasteries of Athos.

In the early years of Christianity, Byzantine Emperors stood firmly for Mount Athos and gave encouragement to this great monastic retreat Today, in these urgent years when Christians are molested and Christianity restricted by atheists and communists, let us take the side of our Lord Jesus Christ in helping Athos, blessed by the Mother of God.

Let Greek officialdom stand side by side in history with the emperors who issued rounds of decrees confirming the rights of the monks and monasteries, 'so that no one shall disturb these Orthodox monks, or enter the inner place of Mount Athos'. It was over a thousand years ago that this guarantee was written, in a Chrysobull of the Emperor Basil I. May King and parliament today do no less! The monks who have prayed so long for us, now need our prayers. Their depleted numbers cry out for replacements. Let young applicants of serious and religious mind, who aspire to extend the faith and work for their own salvation, now apply for entry to the Holy Mount. Protected by the omophor of the Theotokos, the Mother of God, a fully spiritual, useful life can be lived there.

Besides our prayers and the encouragement of applicants devoted to the Church, we should also donate funds for the needs of the monks. Arrange for your public prayers through your priest. Through him also, make your donation to this cause. The aged monks will be grateful for every contribution, however small.

Express your concern about the situation by telling your priest, by writing to the bishop of your diocese, and by writing however briefly, to the Royal Greek Embassy, Attention First Counsellor, Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D C.

Those who wish to further implement their prayers for this urgent cause should do so by sending contributions to:

The Friends of Mount Athos
% Ivan Michaelson Czap
1421 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia 2, Pa.

Notes

Edited by Lamar Hoover

Admission of the Orthodox Patriarchates of Moscow, Bucharest and Sofia together with the Church of Poland to the World Council of Churches took place at the Third General Assembly of the latter body held at New Delhi in November. Three of the member denominations opposed their admission. Four abstained from voting. The Russian Church's application was received by the W C C this spring, and that of the Rumanian Church in late summer. An invitation to membership was extended to the Russian Church at the Council's foundation in 1948. At the time the Patriarchate declined membership citing its interpretations of the attitudes to unity of the Council, and of the latter's role in international and social affairs. The Russian Church has become increasingly friendly since the W C C's Second Assembly, held in Evanston in 1954. After that meeting, a declaration on world peace and disarmament was officially transmitted to the Patriarchate. The Patriarch Alexis, in making application, affirmed the importance attached by his Holy Synod to 'the problems of mutual rapprochement between all Christians, the deepening of mutual understanding among divided Christians, and the strengthening of universal brotherhood, love and peace among the nations on the basis of the Gospel'. The application said that the Russian Church numbers 30,000 priests, 73 bishoprics, 20,000 parishes, 40 monasteries, six seminaries and two academies.

The initiative of the Russian Church has been most favorably received by most Orthodox, Protestants and Old Catholics who are connected with the W C C, despite a long-established and fairly widespread tendency to view the actions of the Patriarchate as manifestations of Soviet policy. This favorable reaction is echoed in the Roman Catholic press: *Informations Catholiques Internationales* of France, for example. This publication said that the action would allow the Church of Moscow to 'emerge at last from its long isolation and establish living contact with other Christian communions' and the W C C to look less 'like a pan-Protestant movement'.

The Rev Irineos Magimbi, a member of the Muganda tribe in Tanganyika, was recently ordained to the priesthood by Archbishop Nicholas of Irinopoleos, who resides in Dar-es-Salaam. The ordination took place in Arusha, Northern Province. Fr Irineos teaches at Chwa II Memorial College in Kasubi. He completed his higher studies in Cairo. The ordination has been widely reported as the first 'of an African priest in the Greek Orthodox Church'! This is clearly erroneous. There are other African priests under the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, including some of the Negro race. The report probably meant that Fr Irineos is the first such priest to be ordained in Tanganyika.

The Shortage of Orthodox Chaplains in the U S Armed Forces has recently been brought home to servicemen in the Far East and in Europe. Father Nicholas Kiryluk, formerly stationed in Japan, and Fr Michael Margitich, formerly in Germany, have both been rotated to stations in the United States, and in neither case has a replacement been available. These two chaplains were the only ones permanently assigned overseas with any branch

of the service. As such, they served immense areas, and brought the sacraments not only to Air Force servicemen and civilians, but also to members of the other services. Despite the shortage, it seems to be difficult to interest qualified priests to undertake this form of service, though vacancies exist.

The legislatures of Wisconsin, North Carolina and Tennessee have recently adopted resolutions recognizing the Church as a 'Major faith'. Such recognition has now been accorded in about 25 states. Similar resolutions have been introduced in the Senate and House but have not yet been acted upon.

The Patriarch Benedictos of Jerusalem recently paid a month's visit to the United States as the guest of the Greek Archdiocese. During the course of his visit he was received by the President, to whom he presented his Patriarchate's highest decoration, the Grand Cross of the Holy Sepulchre. On his return, the Patriarch visited the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Patriarch Cyril of Sophia, whose election has been recognized by the Ecumenical Patriarchate (RNS photo)

The Patriarch Benedictos of Jerusalem, right, with the Metropolitan Athenagoras of Toronto upon his recent visit to Canada. (RNS photo)

The two dioceses of the Armenian Church of America have taken joint action to establish a theological school in Evanston, Ill. Property has been purchased near Seabury-Western Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church, in conjunction with which the new institution – to be known as St Nerses Armenian Theological School – will operate.

The Ecumenical Patriarch has recognized, after eight years, the establishment of the Bulgarian Patriarchate and the election of the Patriarch Cyril. The Bulgarian Church was long regarded as an exarchate by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the election of Cyril had originally been denounced as uncanonical and schismatic.

Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church, Milwaukee, which was designed by the late Frank Lloyd Wright, and which, before it was built, became a subject of some contention in the Greek Archdiocese, was consecrated this summer by Abp Iakovos. Other newly consecrated Orthodox Churches in this country are: Holy Trinity Greek Church, Concord, New Hampshire, and St Nicholas Carpatho-Russian at Jacobs Creek, Pa.

Publications of —
THE BASILIAN FATHERS

Orthodoxy			
Volume VI	ten numbers	(1952-1955)	5.00
Volume VII	ten numbers	(1956-1958)	5.00
Volume VIII	ten numbers	(1958-1961)	5.00
*The Western Mass for Orthodox, with Prime, Vespers and Complin for Sundays		(1952)	.50
*The Western Calendar for Orthodox Catholics		(1950)	.15
Music of the Mass for Penitential Seasons and Requiems, song sheet for the Ordinary of the Mass		(1948)	.05
*Basilian Tracts (new series) Religion and Science, The Bible, The Church, The American Sects, Why do We Suffer? Christian Behavior, Sex, Roman Catholic Claims, Occultism, Why Pray?		set of ten	(1960-61) .25

Items marked with an asterisk are available, upon request with order, punched for insertion in standard six-ring 3-3/4 X 6-3/4" pocket binders.

INTRODUCTION TO ORTHODOXY

– nine essays on the Church, its origins, life and thought for the contemporary reader by Alexander Turner, SSB, – is one of the many interesting features contained in the bound Volume VII of Orthodoxy. In buckram, $5.00 from

Kingsbridge Rd W & Pratt Ave, Mt Vernon, N Y